MYSORE LEGISLATURE SALARIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1967

Leave to introduce (contd.)

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now we will take up debate. Sri K. H. Ranganath had opposed when we adjourned. I would like to inform the House that the ruling that I gave was not the earliest ruling on the point. In fact, there is an earlier ruling which I myself gave on 31st March 1966 pointing out the distinction between a money bill and a Finance Bill and whether consent or recommendation of the Governor is necessary for the stages, *i.e.*, for introduction and for consideration. I have pointed out in that ruling very clearly that if there are matters included in clauses items (a) to (f) together with something else, it is not a money Bill. There were provisions relating to finance and therefore it was contended that it was a money bill. It was pointed out that if it was a composite Bill, money bill in part and includes something else, then it goes out of article 199. Then with regard to second stage, the question of amount being drawn from consolidated fund comes and articles 207 (3) operates. That does not apply so far as introduction is concerned. Provisions are very clear that it relates only to the recommendation for consideration. I have pointed out that. I am only inviting the attention of such members as are desirous of having clear views on that and to the ruling given on that occasion and it deals with all aspects which were mentioned yesterday and which were put forward on that day also.

Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA (Thirthahalli).—Rule 67 says :

> "If the Bill is a Bill which under the Constitution cannot be introduced without the previous sanction or recommendation of the Governor, the Member shall annex to the notice such sanction or recommendation conveyed through a Minister, and the notice shall not be valid until this requirement is complied with."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Therefore, I said it does not come under that. If article 199 applies to the Bill, then this rule applies. Otherwise, this will not apply. Then article 207 (3) applies for consideration. That is why I have pointed out that distinction. All these things are found in detail in the ruling I have given in March 1966. The Ex-Minister Mr. Anna Rao Ganamukhi raised identically the same point as Mr. Siddaveerappa raised and all those points are dealt with there. I will now put it to the vote of the House.

Sri S. SIVAPPA (Sravanabelagola).—A few members on this said have to speak.

Sri K. H. PATIL (Hubli).—Under proviso to rule 71, the Speaker has discretion to permit full discussion. Of course, I cannot as a matter of right stand up and have my say, If you think advisable, then you can permit.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If there is anything new that anybody is going to add, I do not want to shut out, but I do not want repetition. Ultimately it is going to be put to vote. I do not want to shut out debate. Let all points be mentioned by two or three members.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ, ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೆ, ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸಿದ್ಧಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶೀಮಠ್ ಅವರು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಶಾಸಕರ ಸಂಬಳಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿ ನಾನು ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿ ವಿರೋಧಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅವರು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಾವು ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾನು ಇದನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಎರಡು ಕಾರಣಗಳಿವೆ. ಒಂದು ಶಾಸಕರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಳ ವಿರಿಕೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಒಬ್ಬ ಶಾಸಕರು ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ನೀತಿಗೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾದುದು, ಅದು ಕಾನೂನಿಗೊಳಪಟ್ಟಿರಬಹುದು. ಅದು ಬೇರೆ ವಿಷಯ. ಒಬ್ಬ ಶಾಸಕರು ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಜನತೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೇಳದೇ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ತಂದು ತನ್ನ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು ತಾನೇ ಕೇಳಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಒಂದು ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತಾನೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ನೀತಿಗೂ ತಕ್ಕುದಲ್ಲ. ಅದು ನೀತಿಬಾಹಿರವಾದ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಎರಡನೆಯದು, ಶಾಸಕರ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಮಾಡುವ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಹಣದ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ವಹಿಸದೇ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಒಬ್ಬ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ಧಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶೀಮಠ್ ಅವರು ಒಂದು ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನೂಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ವಂಥಾದ್ದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದು.

ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣಕಾಸಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಚಾರವಿದೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇ ಇಂತಹ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ನೇರವಾಗಿ ಹಾಗೂ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯುತವಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತರಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಎದೆಗಾರಿಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಬೇರೆ ಯಾರೋ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಮೂಲಕ ತರಿಸಿರುವುದು ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ನೀತಿಬಾಹಿರವಾದುದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ನಾನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ವಿರೋಧಿಸಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ಧಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶೀಮಠ್ ಅವರನ್ನು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ಧಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶೀಮಠ್ (ಶಿರಹಟ್ಟಿ).—ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ : ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತರಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅಂಥಾದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ನೀತಿ ಬಾಹಿರ ಏನೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ವಿಶದೀಪಡಿಸಬೇಕು.]

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member Sri Siddiah Kasimath raised a point of order saying that the Leader of the Opposition while addressing the House said that bringing a Bill by a Member is "Neeti Bahira" "ನೀತಿ ಬಾಹಿರ"

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಸ್. ಕೃಷ್ಣನ್ (ಮಲ್ಲೇಶ್ವರಂ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ಧಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶೀಮಠ್ ಅವರು ತಪ್ಪು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ತಾವಲ್ಲ.

Sri SIDDAIAH KASIMATH.—At least now my learned friend must know. Bill means anything, it may be financial Bill or anything. There should be some meaning in his observation.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is the right of every member to bring a Bill before the House. When this is brought on behalf of the Government, it is called a Government Bill. And if it is introduced by a Member of the Council of Ministers and tends to regulate the Government business, it is called a Government Bill. The other Bills that are introduced by other Members are called Private Bills. The classification of Public and Private Bills or Government Bills *vis-a-vis* Private Bills have been established since a long time past. Nobody has ever questioned the right of a particular Member to move a Private Bill. On the other hand, every encouragement is given to a private Member to bring a Bill. There is a

(MR. SPEAKER)

specialcommittee which is dealing with such matters and it is said time and again that while the Government has got the entire machinery at its disposal for drafting, there is serious handicap to private Members inasmuch as they do not have the same facilities. So the Legislature Secretary is expected to give them the fullest guidance and encourage them to bring them, rather than discourage them.

(Sri H. Siddaveerappa rose)

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—I request Sri Siddaveerappa to yield. The United Front here consists of different political parties. As a constituent of the Party, I would like to say something as a member of the Communist Party. An opportunity may be kindly given to me.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Harihar) —Sir, this is a Bill which has not come in the ordinary course. Here, there are various Parties and those Parties have, of course, amalgmated or federated into one United Front. Our Leader has spoken for each one of us generally and specifically for his party. But it may be essential that everybody should make it known before the bar of public opinion his view and the view of the Party to which he belongs so far as this Bill is concerned.

So far as this Bill is concerned, probably with your erudite scholarship and legal acumen, you may be knowing that such a thing has not happened in any Parliament or Legislature anywhere in the world. This Bill has been introduced by a non-official member with the connivance of the members on the Treasury Benches. Therefore, we have to give vent to our own feelings. We are in young democracy. We have to nurture it and build it carefully, The foreigners also are watching how democracy works in this country. There are also critics who have been saying that our democracy is moving on tribal lines and things like that. We are keenly interested in seeing that democracy in this country—whether at the State level or at the Parliamentary and All-India level proceeds on proper lines and on very strict lines. Therefore, in whatever we do, and in whatever measures we deal here, and say, we must be very circumspect becuase the country is at large is watching us. Apart from that, the outside world will also be looking at us and judging us.

So far as this Bill is concerned, there are so many angles from which we should scrutinise it. You have to examine it from the point of view of equity; you have to examine it from ethical, moral and various other grounds. We know for certain that our friend 'Bharatha' who is here, is working behind the screen. The Bharatha of our mythology is known for both rectitude and truthfulness. He is also known for doing good to the country. He never occupied the throne offered to him; he allowed others to occupy it. But here is our 'Bharatha' who is the moving spirit behind this Bill, however much he may deny. I attach the greatest respect to the opinion of this hon'ble

House provided this issue of enhancement of salaries of Legislators had been brought before our Constituencies. Have we consulted the general electorate? No. By this Bill, our salaries are sought to be enhanced. Later on when the Ministers' Salaries Amendment Bill comes, I will speak. Now I will limit myself only to this Legislature Salaries Amendment Bill. In so far as this Bill is concerned, public opinion should be elicited. If we don't do it, it will be the blackest enactment on the anvil of the entire Legislature. However much one may canvass, it does not make an appeal to me. After all the sum of Rs. 400 is as good as Rs. 250. After all we Members are not Ministers. Do you know how much goodi-goodies and do-nothings cost us? Each Minister costs us not less than Rs. 80 thousand per annum, apart from the perquisites and various other facilities and amenities they enjoy. When the Ministers' Salaries and Allowances Amendment Bill comes before us, let me consider it later on. There must be the semblance of truth in their argument when they say that the cost of living has risen, to make a ground for enhancement of Legislators' and Ministers' salaries. Is this phenomenon exceptional to our class? Do you know how much it has gone up in our rural parts? I have worked with my coolies in the field last year and I have personal knowledge of their plight. If I give them one rupee each per day our Hon'ble Minister Mr. Jatti won't give more than three-fourths Kg. of ragi or rice; and if the chaff and husk are removed from it, he won't get two bread pieces per day. If they want practical proof of it, let the hon'ble Ministers come with me, I will show. We should not think very high of ourselves sitting in this beautiful canopied hall. We should not think of different or higher standards of living for ourselves. We should compare ourselves with the man-in-the-street. We should not fix higher salaries for the legislators comparing ourselves with those who are more affluent and leading a higher standard of life than ourselves. We must always compare ourselves with those who are less fortunate than ourselves who connot afford even one square meal a day; when we do so, Rs. 250 that we get is really much more, and more than what we should be really paid. May be there are other higher standards as between the motor car and the aeroplane. There is no end to man's material desires and wants. When I have not got anything in my pocket, I shall be happy to go in a rickshaw; when I cannot spend even on a rickshaw, I will go on a bicycle; when that too is not available or cannot be afforded, I would prefer walking. Rs. 250 is more than sufficient to buy more than two loaves of bread and lead a standard of life higher than that of a common man. For standards of life, there are no limits. How do you say that Rs. 400 would be sufficient? Of course, in the view of the Government it may be a mere pittance. When supplementary demands, the Finance Minister deals in five digits; The Government is accustomed to deal in huge figures and it may be nothing for them. For *bala Bore gowda* it is an unbearable burden. We should not forget that we owe a duty to our children and grand children. By such unnecessary expenditure, we are going to put all these debts on t[illegible] heads of our children and grandchildren; posterity

(Sri H. Siddaveerappa)

will curse us. Let it not be said that because we the legislators have got power now to make laws, we have abused that power. The Government will be pleading off and on that they have no money for development works. Our hon. Finance Minister has been dinning this into our ears.

2-30 P.M.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE (Sankeswar).—On a point of order Sir, Rule 71 speaks only that members should indicate their opposition to leave being granted. It does not indicate any discussion or debate on the merits of a particular measure. My Hon'ble friend is speaking as if the entire bill is before the House and making reference to many many extraneous matters. The bill is not introduced. It is not before the House. I request a ruling may be given whether this could be done.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Shall I give a ruling ?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, before that, I may be heard. My friend Sri Kothavale knows law very well. If I merely say: 'I object, I object', what am I going to object ? I remember an incident in this connection. There was a lawyer arguing in a case in a court. He merely said: 'I oppose, I oppose and I oppose'. The Judge asked: 'What are you opposing ? You are standing here before me and arguing before me'. So, whenever I oppose, I must adduce reasons for it. I have seen in better places where there are consciencious objections for any measure even at the stage of introduction. After hearing my argument my friend Sri Siddaiah Kasimath may withdraw the Bill. Therefore, I am persuading him with all the humility at my command and with all the vehemence.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If members raise points of order, what can I do ? I am helpless. I will give my ruling. There is one point on which my discretion is absolutely closed and fettered. If members say : "Sir, you should not reserve the ruling" I will not reserve the ruling.

A point of order has been raised by Hon'ble Member Sri S. D. Kothavale saying that the terms of the rules which permit opposition to the motion before the House indicating introduction or leave to introduce a particular Bill is limited to indicate the point and not *inextenso*, exhaustive arguments or debate as could be made when the Bill is introduced. In fact, he asserts that detailed debate is practically covering the provisions and the particulars embodied in the Bill and it will amount to a debate before its introduction.

The answer furnished by Hon'ble Member Sri Siddaveerappa is a reference to one incident which he had witnessed in some court where the judge was made to hear a lawyer repeating three times 'I oppose, I oppose and I oppose' and asked him something else. It only indicates that mere opposition will not do ; the House must apply its mind and find out whether there is any substance in the opposition and the result of the debate may be so good as to persuade the member to withdraw

the Bill. In this aspect he thought the motion before the House would be withdrawn by the mover with the leave of the House. I am not dealing with that aspect because it does not directly arise.

But, I do appreciate to some extent what Sri Siddaveerappa said. In fact, the rule says that he must be heard with regard to what he says by way of opposition. But, that does not certainly mean that there could be a full-dress debate because the motion is only to introduce. After the Bill is introduced, there is going to be a full-dress debate. In fact, the provisions of the Bill are not before the House though a copy has been circulated to the members and they may have read it. It is in this context we have to remember as to how to interpret this particular rule.

Therefore, my ruling is, something briefly indicating on what lines they oppose could be said and not at all deal with every particular or every provision or the scope of the Bill. I have no doubt that Hon'ble Member Sri Siddaveerappa, with the wealth of his parliamentary experience, knows fully the difference between full-dress debate and a debate by way of preliminary stage and when mere introduction is to be considered by the House. The convention is, not only in our legislature but elsewhere, at the stage of introduction, there is little or no debate. But, it does not mean legally or by way of right the scope of the debate is shut out; but, undoubtedly, the scope is limited. Sri Siddaveerappa may continue.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, I oppose the introduction of this measure.

Sri K. H. PATIL (Gadag).—Sir, I oppose this Bill on certain points and grounds which have not been narrated so far. Under rule 71, I am entitled to say something provided the Speaker permits me to do so. In the interest of justice and fairplay the rule provides the Speaker with wide powers, to allow the member to oppose the Bill to be introduced. Therefore, any person who intends to oppose the Bill is entitled to seek the permission of the Speaker.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಸ್. ಕೃಷ್ಣನ್.—ನಾನು ಕೂಡ ಅದೇ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು 2-3 ಸಲ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡೆ. ಜೇರೆಯವರು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರು. ನಾವು ಬರೇ ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ವಿರೋಧ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದರೆ ಸಾಕು ಎಂದು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿದೆ. ನಾವು ರೂಲ್ 71ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ವಿರೋಧ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸುವುದಲ್ಲದೆ, ಏತಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಾವು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರಿ. ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If members say that everybody must be heard, that means, I must have to ascertain how many are there to speak so that the time may be allocated and I must also ascertain what exactly is the time to be allocated to everybody. How is that to be done? I am prepared to go to this extent; I am prepared to have the names of those who want to oppose; if there is anything in addition, if there is anything new, they may indicate the points. I will give two minutes.

Sri M. RAMAPPA (Hosadurga).—If chance is given under rule 71 to other members, in that case those who want to support the Bill must also be given a chance.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Others are supporting the opposition and not opposing the opposition. The opposition is reinforcing what has already has been opposed by Sri K. H. Ranganath.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಸ್. ಕೃಷ್ಣನ್.—ಒಂದೇ ಒಂದು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯ. ತಾವು ಆಗಲೇ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ತಾವು ಮನಿ ಬಿಲ್ ಹಾಗೂ ಬೇರೆಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಚಾರ ಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರ ಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇವರು ನಂಬಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪಾಸ್ತಿಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಾಗಲಿ, ಅಥವಾ ಬೇರೆ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಾಗಲಿ, ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಯಾರೂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದದ್ದು ಅಲ್ಲ. ಹೋದ ಕೆಲವು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಹಿಂದೆ ಚುನಾವಣೆ ನಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ, ಇದೇ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಒಂದು ನಲ ಉಂಟಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆಗ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಪಟ್ಟರೂ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗೆ ಹೆದರಿಕೊಂಡು ಆಗಲಿಲ್ಲ ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಆ ಮನೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಪಾಪನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರು. ಈಗ ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಅದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹಿತ್ತಲ ಬಾಗಿಲಿನಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿರುವುದು ಸೌಜನ್ಯ ವಾದುದಲ್ಲ, ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದುದಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ಟ್ರೇಡಿಶನ್ ಮತ್ತು ಪರಂಪರೆಗೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಕುತಂತ್ರ ನಡೆಸಿರುವುದು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್‌ನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲ. ಅವರು ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರನ್ನು ಯಾರನ್ನೊ ಒಬ್ಬರನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡು ಈ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The point is, I made a specific request to you to say anything new. There is nothing new in what has been stated.

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—There has been a violation of a particular tradition laid down in all the legislatures in India. One more point is, the present situation and the climate in the country is so much against that it does not warrant a Bill of this kind being introduced. All over the country there is talk of wage freeze, price freeze and profit freeze; there is demand for increase D. A. paid to the N.G.Os. The Government is not prepared to grant these things. But here they are coming to see that the salaries of the ministers are increased, salaries of the members are increased.

Sri D. M. SIDDIAH (Biligere).—On a point of order. My friend is commenting on the ruling party. The Bill has been introduced by Sri Siddiah Kashimath in his individual capacity. He has made it very clear. Even the Hon'ble Member Sri H. Siddaveerappa when he made a reference that the minister is the force behind this Bill, I wanted to object but I did not do it. Sri Siddiah Kashimath has moved it in his individual capacity and I do not know why the Hon'ble Member is commenting on others? Therefore, as you correctly pointed out, if any member has anything to say without unnecessarily making reference to others, he is entitled to do so.

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—Sir, before you give a ruling I want to say that Sri Siddiah Kashimath has not brought this out of his own volition. I charge the ruling party and it is they who conspired to bring this. That is my charge.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ಆಂಜನಪ್ಪ (ಪಾವಗಡ).—ಸ್ಪೀಮಿ, ಈ ಬಿಲ್ ಪಾಸಾಗುವುದು ಬಿಡುವುದು ಬೇರೆ ಮಾತು. ಪಾಸ್ ಆದರೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಸಂಬಳ ಅವರು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಬಿಡುವುದು ಅವರಿಗೇ ಸೇರಿದ್ದು. ಅದು ಬೇರೆ ಮಾತು. ಗುಲಗಂಜಿ ತನ್ನ ಕಪ್ಪನ್ನು ಮರೆತು ಎಲ್ಲವೂ ಕಪ್ಪಗೆ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದರಂತೆ ಇವರುಗಳು ನುಮ್ಮಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member Sri D. M. Siddiah raised a point of order. He stated that the Hon'ble Member Sri M. S. Krishnan in his speech made certain insinuations namely that some people are behind the Hon'ble Member who has introduced the Bill and tried to say that somebody else is actually interested in having it done. I do not know whether such insinuation should be made at all on the floor of the House. Any way at the stage of introduction as to who introduces, and how it is introduced are only to be considered by what the Hon'ble Member who has given notice and who seeks leave of the House, is to be dealt with and not any other thing at all.

I am putting the motion to the Vote of the House.

The question is :

"That leave be granted to Sri Siddiah Kashimath to introduce the Mysore Legislature Salaries (Amendment) Bill, 1967."

Those that are in favour of the motion will say 'Aye.'

Those that are against the motion will say 'No.'

I think Ayes have it...

Sri B. D. JATTI (Minister for Food and Civil Supplies).—I press for a division.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—The Division is asked for by the Congress party. The country will know what it is.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order.

The question is :

"That leave be granted to Sri Siddaiah Kashimath to introduce the Mysore Legislature Salaries (Amendment) Bill, 1967."

The motion put and the House divided.

AYES : 73
NOES : 43

The motion was adopted.

(*Shouts "Shame" "Shame" from the Opposition Benches*)

Sri SIDDIAH KASHIMATH.—Sir, I beg to introduce the Mysore Legislature Salaries (Amendment) Bill, 1967.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Mysore Legislature Salaries (Amendment) Bill, 1967 is introduced.